

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,038	HITZELBERGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Terrence R. Till	1744

All Participants:

(1) Terrence R. Till.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) W. Schickli.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 August 2006

Time: 9:10am

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 8, 11

Prior art documents discussed:

Sepke (US 6,558,453- cited in PTO-892)


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicant's representative to inform him that claims 1 and 8 could read on Sepke '453 as Sepke '453 is considered to have a combined handle 115 and inlet flow passageway 116 spaced from the sidewall of the dirt container 106. Additionally, applicant's representative was informed that claim 8 is broad enough to read on a container having a hollow handle spaced from the container wall. The examiner proposed amending claims 1 and 8 to recite --a handle defining an inlet flow passageway-- and incorporating the language of claim 11 into claim 8 to obviate a rejection over Sepke et al. '43 and any potential rejection over a container. Applicant's representative agreed to the changes.